

## REMARKS

The application currently stands restricted to Group I, claims 1-17 and Group II, claims 18 and 19. Applicants hereby affirm the provisional election but have rendered the restriction requirement moot by canceling claims 18 and 19. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the outstanding restriction requirement be withdrawn.

The drawings stand objected to because Figure 1 appears to show the pin and shoes as being comprised of a one piece element. In response, Applicants have attached a proposed drawing connection that shows these features as separate components in order to better conform to the written specification. A replacement drawing sheet with the proposed drawing correction incorporated therein is also included. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner approve the proposed drawing correction, withdraw the outstanding drawing objection and enter the replacement drawing sheet.

The disclosure stands objected to for several minor issues noted in the office action. In response, Applicants have amended the specification as per the Examiner's helpful suggestion. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the outstanding objections to the disclosure be withdrawn.

The specification stands objected to with regard to supposedly failing to provide antecedent basis for the limitations of claim 16, lines 3 and 4. In response, Applicants respectfully refer the Examiner's attention to Figures 2 and 3, and the specification at least at paragraph [23] where the rotor and shaft are clearly shown and described as having an eccentric relationship with regard to a centerline through the housing. Since the application as originally filed does show and describe the claimed subject matter, Applicants respectfully request that the outstanding objection to the specification be withdrawn.

The abstract stands objected to because it includes certain offensive phrases. In response, Applicants have amended the abstract to remove the offending phrases. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the outstanding objection to the abstract be withdrawn.

Claims 1 and 9 stand objected to because of certain minor wording errors that are identified in the office action. In response, Applicants have amended these claims in a way that is believed to overcome the outstanding objection. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the outstanding objection to claims 1 and 9 be withdrawn.

Claims 5 and 10 stand rejected under 35 USC §112 over apparent confusion over which bore is referred to the respective claim line identified in the office action. In response, Applicants have amended these claims to make it clear that it is a shoe bore, which should avoid any confusion. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the outstanding §112 rejections be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 7-9 and 11-12 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(b) over Cline. Applicants respectfully disagree and assert that the claims were never intended to be misread onto the twentieth century water wheel disclosed by Cline. Nevertheless, in order to better prevent Applicants' claims

from being misread onto references of the type represented by Cline, Applicants have amended independent claims 1 and 11 to make it clear that the rotating shaft is in contact with the driven member (rotor). There should be no dispute that Cline fails to show or suggest any such feature. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that all of the §102(b) rejections based upon Cline be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 2, 4-9 and 11-12 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(b) over Tang. Applicants respectfully disagree since Tang neither shows what the office action asserts nor what Applicants have claimed. It is simply unfair to characterize the suspension apparatus of Tang as even including a rotational coupling or showing even a fan let along a pump as required by Applicants' claims. For instance, how can Applicants even respond to the office action assertion that Tang's item 40 is Applicants' claimed pump housing? While Applicants concede that Tang coincidentally includes some features that are similar to Applicants' claimed invention, there should be no dispute that the suspension structure taught by Tang is assembled by mating threads of one component to another in a way that distorts the shape of an inner component to grip the shaft. However, it would be unfair to mischaracterize the non-rotating suspension structure of Tang as being Applicants' claimed rotational coupling and/or pump. Therefore, Applicants respectfully invite the Examiner to again review Tang for what it actually teaches and withdraw all of the outstanding rejections based upon the same.

Claims 1, 3, 6, 8, 9 and 11 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(b) over Matsumoto. Applicants respectfully disagree since the entire Matsumoto disclosure is directed to an intermediate fastening section that is disposed between its rotating shaft and its driven member. Because the intermediate member is taught as being press fit onto the shaft, it cannot satisfy Applicants' claim requirement of a coupling that includes a drive surface connected to be separated a radial distance from the rotating shaft. On the other hand, if the fan hub of Matsumoto is characterized as Applicants' claimed rotor or driven member, Applicants' claims are distinguishable since the intermediate fastening section prevents contact between the rotating shaft and the fan hub, which again is different from what Applicants have claimed. Thus, regardless of how the features of Matsumoto are characterized, there is no fair characterization upon which Applicants' claims can be read. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the outstanding §102(b) rejections be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5 and 7-9 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(b) over Benson. Applicants respectfully disagree and assert that it is unfair the misread Applicants' claimed invention onto the universal joint taught by Benson. Nevertheless, Applicants have amended independent claims 1 and 11 to make it clear that the rotating shaft is in contact with the driven member (rotor). Therefore, since Applicants claims can no longer be misread onto anything fairly taught by Benson, Applicants respectfully request that the outstanding §102(b) rejections based upon Benson be withdrawn.


Claims 3 and 13-15 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) over Cline. Again, Applicants respectfully disagree since Cline cannot be fairly interpreted as showing or suggesting the features of respective base claims 1 and 11. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the outstanding §103(a) rejections based upon Cline be withdrawn.

Claims 3, 10 and 13-17 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) over Tang. Again, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner again review Tang, for it neither shows a rotational coupling, a fan or anything that could be fairly characterized as a pump. Instead, Tang discloses a non-rotating suspension apparatus for a ceiling fan, which is something entirely different than what Applicants have claimed. Therefore, Applicants respectfully invite the Examiner to provide fair characterizations of the various features of Tang, and when this is done, there should be no dispute that Applicants' claims cannot even coincidentally be read upon the non-rotating suspension apparatus taught by Tang. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the outstanding §103(a) rejections based upon Tang be withdrawn.

New claims 20-22 have been added and are believed allowable over the art of record. No additional fee is believed required since the application includes 20 claims. Nevertheless, the Director is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to deposit account 500226.

This application is now believed to be in condition for allowance of claims 1-17 and 20-22. However, if the Examiner believes that some minor additional clarification would put this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at (812) 333-5355 in order to hasten the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'MB McNeil', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Michael B. McNeil  
Reg. No: 35,949

**Fig 1**

